



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,959	04/26/2002	Yong-Seok Jeong	08015.0006	6058

22852 7590 07/25/2008
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

MUSSELMAN, TIMOTHY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/018,959	Applicant(s) JEONG, YONG-SEOK	
	Examiner TIMOTHY MUSSELMAN	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-9,15-17,23-34,36 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-9,15-17,23-34,36 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.1114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/1/2008 has been entered, and claims 1, 7-9, 15-17, 23-34, and 36-37 are pending in this case. Claims 2-6, 10-14, 18-22, and 35 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the relevant portion of 35 U.S.C. 103 that forms the basis for the rejections made in this section of the office action;

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Claim 1, 7, 9, 15, 17, 23, 25-34, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Galdes et al. (US 6,177,932).

Regarding claims 1, 9, and 17, Galdes broadly discloses a network and methods for providing network based customer service (i.e. counseling). See col. 1: 54-67. Galdes further discloses receiving a query from a user containing information pertaining to counseling data retrieval. See col. 1: 55-60, wherein the menu interface is described, and col. 4: 54-64, wherein it is disclosed that the query contains counseling data retrieval information (i.e. a question and customer history data). Galdes further discloses the creation

of a counseling room in which the user and counselor interact from their respective computers. See col. 8: 64 – col. 9: 3. Regarding the generation of an identification code based on the category of the query, applicant is directed to col. 8: 55-58. Note in this citation that the help request is directed to an appropriate counselor based on the counselor's level of knowledge *in the area of the help request*. Although there is no explicit reference to an ID code, the category data is clearly encoded in the help request in some fashion or else it would not be possible to direct the help request to appropriate counselors *based on the area of the help request*. Note this citation also discloses the selection of one of many counselors based on the contents of the help request. Note also that the *selection* of a counselor based on area of expertise implies a *plurality* of counselors to choose from. While Galdes does not explicitly define an ID code the user selects with a click to interact with a counselor, the customer nevertheless submits the necessary data to select the counselor. The general concept of utilizing categories and topics to get help information is disclosed by Galdes in col. 1: 55-60, but in reference to the self help searching portion of the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand this hierarchal category concept to the other aspects of the invention as well, in order to improve the product by narrowing the relevant results returned (the results in this case would be relevant counselors). Galdes further discloses wherein the system is on a network, and wherein there are multiple web pages in the system. See col. 4: 41-53. Galdes further discloses a counseling room. See col. 3: 24-29

Regarding claim 7, 15, and 23, Galdes further discloses wherein the counseling room is a real time chat room. See col. 3: 24-29.

Regarding claims 25-30, see the rejections of claims 1 above.

Regarding claim 31, 34, and 37, all of the features are rejected as described with respect to claim 1 above, including the inclusion of web-tracks in the identity. Galdes further discloses wherein basic

information includes general examples of counseling related to the webpage of the user. See col. 5: 54-60.

Regarding claims 32-33, see the rejection of claim 1 above, wherein it is described that the user does provide category information, which is also user-related information as per claim 33.

Regarding claim 36, Galdes further discloses wherein the chatting can occur via text, video, or voice. See col. 3: 24-39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the relevant portion of 35 U.S.C. 103 that forms the basis for the rejections made in this section of the office action;

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Claims 8, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galdes et al. (US 6,177,932) in view of Szlam et al. (US 5,594,791).

Regarding claims 8, 16, and 24, Galdes discloses wherein said counseling room is a chat room, where said chat room corresponds with said query. See col. 3: 24-29 and col. 4: 54-64. Galdes fails to teach of providing advertisement in the chat room. However, Szlam teaches of providing advertisements within a customer service setting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the advertisements of Szlam into the system of Galdes, in order to provide additional revenue to recover operating costs.

Response to Arguments

Applicants arguments dated 2/1/2008 have been fully considered, and they are persuasive. Applicant's arguments all pertain to the fact that Galdes does not disclose a simplified menu selection interface wherein a user selects the counselor directly through a link with an ID code. Examiner concurs with this argument, however, new grounds of rejection have been found as described above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy Musselman whose telephone number is (571)272-1814. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 6:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571)272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. M./
Acting Examiner of Art Unit 3714

/Robert Pezzuto/
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714

Application/Control Number: 10/018,959
Art Unit: 3714

Page 6